

**§ 37.540 May I accept fully depreciated real property or equipment as cost sharing?**

You should limit the value of any contribution of a fully depreciated asset to a reasonable use charge. In determining what is reasonable, you must consider:

- (a) The original cost of the asset;
- (b) Its estimated remaining useful life at the time of your negotiations;
- (c) The effect of any increased maintenance charges or decreased performance due to age; and
- (d) The amount of depreciation that the participant previously charged to Federal awards.

**§ 37.545 May I accept costs of prior research as cost sharing?**

No, you may not count any participant's costs of prior research as a cost sharing contribution. Only the additional resources that the recipient will provide to carry out the current project (which may include pre-award costs for the current project, as described in § 37.830) are to be counted.

**§ 37.550 May I accept intellectual property as cost sharing?**

(a) In most instances, you should not count costs of patents and other intellectual property (*e.g.*, copyrighted material, including software) as cost sharing, because:

- (1) It is difficult to assign values to these intangible contributions;
  - (2) Their value usually is a manifestation of prior research costs, which are not allowed as cost share under § 37.545; and
  - (3) Contributions of intellectual property rights generally do not represent the same cost of lost opportunity to a recipient as contributions of cash or tangible assets. The purpose of cost share is to ensure that the recipient incurs real risk that gives it a vested interest in the project's success.
- (b) You may include costs associated with intellectual property if the costs are based on sound estimates of market value of the contribution. For example, a for-profit firm may offer the use of commercially available software for which there is an established license fee for use of the product. The costs of the development of the software would

not be a reasonable basis for valuing its use.

**§ 37.555 How do I value a recipient's other contributions?**

For types of participant contributions other than those addressed in §§ 37.535 through 37.550, the general rule is that you are to value each contribution consistently with the cost principles or standards in § 37.625 and § 37.635 that apply to the participant making the contribution. When valuing services and property donated by parties other than the participants, you may use as guidance the provisions of 32 CFR 34.13(b)(2) through (5).

**FIXED-SUPPORT OR EXPENDITURE-BASED APPROACH****§ 37.560 Must I be able to estimate project expenditures precisely in order to justify use of a fixed-support TIA?**

(a) To use a fixed-support TIA, rather than an expenditure-based TIA, you must have confidence in your estimate of the expenditures required to achieve well-defined outcomes. Therefore, you must work carefully with program officials to select outcomes that, when the recipient achieves them, are reliable indicators of the amount of effort the recipient expended. However, your estimate of the required expenditures need not be a precise dollar amount, as illustrated by the example in paragraph (b) of this section, if:

- (1) The recipient is contributing a substantial share of the costs of achieving the outcomes, which must meet the criteria in § 37.305(a); and
- (2) You are confident that the costs of achieving the outcomes will be at least a minimum amount that you can specify and the recipient is willing to accept the possibility that its cost sharing percentage ultimately will be higher if the costs exceed that minimum amount.

(b) To illustrate the approach, consider a project for which you are confident that the recipient will have to expend at least \$800,000 to achieve the specified outcomes. You must determine, in conjunction with program officials, the minimum level of recipient cost sharing that you want to negotiate, based on the circumstances, to

demonstrate the recipient's commitment to the success of the project. For purposes of this illustration, let that minimum recipient cost sharing be 40% of the total project costs. In that case, the Federal share should be no more than 60% and you could set a fixed level of Federal support at \$480,000 (60% of \$800,000). With that fixed level of Federal support, the recipient would be responsible for the balance of the costs needed to complete the project.

(c) Note, however, that the level of recipient cost sharing you negotiate is to be based solely on the level needed to demonstrate the recipient's commitment. You may not use a shortage of Federal Government funding for the program as a reason to try to persuade a recipient to accept a fixed-support TIA, rather than an expenditure-based instrument, or to accept responsibility for a greater share of the total project costs than it otherwise is willing to offer. If you lack sufficient funding to provide an appropriate Federal Government share for the entire project, you instead should rescope the effort covered by the agreement to match the available funding.

**§ 37.565 May I use a hybrid instrument that provides fixed support for only a portion of a project?**

Yes, for a research project that is to be carried out by a number of participants, you may award a TIA that provides for some participants to perform under fixed-support arrangements and others to perform under expenditure-based arrangements. This approach may be useful, for example, if a commercial firm that is a participant will not accept an agreement with all of the post-award requirements of an expenditure-based award. Before using a fixed-support arrangement for that firm's portion of the project, you must judge that it meets the criteria in § 37.305.

**ACCOUNTING, PAYMENTS, AND RECOVERY OF FUNDS**

**§ 37.570 What must I do if a CAS-covered participant accounts differently for its own and the Federal Government shares of project costs?**

(a) If a participant has Federal procurement contracts that are subject to the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS)

in part 30 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and the associated FAR Appendix (48 CFR part 30 and 48 CFR 9903.201–1, respectively), you must alert the participant during the pre-award negotiations to the potential for a CAS violation, as well as the cognizant administrative contracting officer (ACO) for the participant's procurement contracts, if you learn that the participant plans to account differently for its own share and the Federal Government's share of project costs under the TIA. This may arise, for example, if a for-profit firm or other organization subject to the FAR cost principles in 48 CFR parts 31 and 231 proposes to charge:

(1) Its share of project costs as independent research and development (IR&D) costs to enable recovery of the costs through Federal Government procurement contracts, as allowed under the FAR cost principles; and

(2) The Federal Government's share to the project, rather than as IR&D costs.

(b) The reason for alerting the participant and the ACO is that the inconsistent charging of the two shares could cause a noncompliance with Cost Accounting Standard (CAS) 402. Noncompliance with CAS 402 is a potential issue only for a participant that has CAS-covered Federal procurement contracts (note that CAS requirements do not apply to a for-profit participant's TIAs).

(c) For for-profit participants with CAS-covered procurement contracts, the cognizant ACO in most cases will be an individual within the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA). You can identify a cognizant ACO at the DCMA by querying the contract administration team locator that matches contractors with their ACOs (currently on the World Wide Web at <http://alerts.dcmdw.dcmamil/support>, a site that also can be accessed through the DCMA home page at <http://www.dcmamil>).